

<b><i>Interview Summary</i></b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/073,204	NAMBA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Robert M. Pond	3625	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Robert M. Pond. (3) \_\_\_\_.

(2) Mr. Mark D. Pratt, #45,794. (4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 17 July 2009.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 48-52.

Identification of prior art discussed: Ginter.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Clarified "uncirculated content" but did resolve language to replace "un-circulated".

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Robert M. Pond/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3625	
---	--

## Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

### **Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record**

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

### **Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews Paragraph (b)**

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

#### 37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,  
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

### **Examiner to Check for Accuracy**

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

**Pond, Robert**

---

**From:** Mark D. Pratt [mpratt@wenderoth.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, July 17, 2009 12:47 PM  
**To:** Pond, Robert  
**Subject:** RE: Atty Docket #2002\_0230A

Examiner Pond: Just to summarize our discussion today. Uncirculated as claimed corresponds to delivery of content for the first time (e.g., from a creator), which appears to be supported by the primary circulation described in the specification. Circulated as claimed corresponds to content that is being re-delivered (i.e., was already delivered in the primary circulation), which appears to be supported by the secondary circulation described in the specification.

Sincerely,

Mark D. Pratt

for

WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P.  
Attorneys and Counselors at Law  
Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights  
1030 15th Street, N.W., Suite 400 East  
Washington, DC 20005 U.S.A.

Confidentiality Notice:

This e-mail message and any attachments are confidential, may be privileged, and may contain proprietary information. This email is intended exclusively for the individual or entity to which it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify Wenderoth, Lind & Ponack, L.L.P. immediately by replying to this message or by sending an e-mail to [wlp@wenderoth.com](mailto:wlp@wenderoth.com), and destroy all copies of this message and any attachments. Thank you. If you are not the intended recipient, you are not authorized to read, print, copy, retain, or disseminate this email or any information included in this email.

For more information about Wenderoth, Lind & Ponack, L.L.P., please visit us on the web at [www.wenderoth.com](http://www.wenderoth.com)

---

**From:** Pond, Robert [mailto:[Robert.Pond@USPTO.GOV](mailto:Robert.Pond@USPTO.GOV)]  
**Sent:** Friday, July 17, 2009 11:40 AM  
**To:** Mark D. Pratt  
**Subject:** RE: Atty Docket # 2002\_0230A  
**Importance:** High

Mr. Pratt,

If you believe that, in light of the clarification to uncirculated and circulated during our telephone discussion, Ginter still does not cover this, you are welcome to send me informal remarks for consideration for review. Since a claim must be examined as a whole, the combination of all steps need to be reviewed. I'll look at it later today if you are inclined to send comments along with your clarification.

Rob Pond

---

**From:** Mark D. Pratt [mailto:[mpratt@wenderoth.com](mailto:mpratt@wenderoth.com)]

**Sent:** Thursday, July 16, 2009 6:58 PM  
**To:** Pond, Robert  
**Subject:** RE: Atty Docket #2002\_0230A

Examiner Pond: Let me give you a call tomorrow. I will try to give you a call sometime before lunch.  
Thanks

Sincerely,

Mark D. Pratt

for

WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P.  
Attorneys and Counselors at Law  
Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights  
1030 15th Street, N.W., Suite 400 East  
Washington, DC 20005 U.S.A.

Confidentiality Notice:

This e-mail message and any attachments are confidential, may be privileged, and may contain proprietary information. This email is intended exclusively for the individual or entity to which it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify Wenderoth, Lind & Ponack, L.L.P. immediately by replying to this message or by sending an e-mail to [wlp@wenderoth.com](mailto:wlp@wenderoth.com), and destroy all copies of this message and any attachments. Thank you. If you are not the intended recipient, you are not authorized to read, print, copy, retain, or disseminate this email or any information included in this email.

For more information about Wenderoth, Lind & Ponack, L.L.P., please visit us on the web at [www.wenderoth.com](http://www.wenderoth.com)

---

**From:** Pond, Robert [mailto:[Robert.Pond@USPTO.GOV](mailto:Robert.Pond@USPTO.GOV)]  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 16, 2009 4:25 PM  
**To:** Mark D. Pratt  
**Subject:** Atty Docket #2002\_0230A  
**Importance:** High

Mr. Pratt,  
I concluded we cannot move forward until we resolve the circulated/ non-circulated issue.

Records indicate we are claiming the second embodiment. Primary circulation and secondary circulation are defined. Content purchased as a result of primary circulation and moved via the secondary circulation is defined as resale content (typically a resaler would be adding markup to the resold content) whereas content from primary circulation that is not purchased but moved into secondary circulation is defined as intermediated content (results in intermediation fees when finally sold).

As you can see, referring to "primary circualtion" as uncirculated and "secondary circulation" as circulated is confusing and contradictory. Both primary and secondary paths result in "circulation" of the content regardless. I believe we can reach agreement on terminology that is consistent with the specification.

Also, need to clarify whether one content comprises i) content from the resale path and ii) content from the intermediation path or devices have the capability to manage both types of content (resale and intermediated content) by a content distributing device (e.g. Fig. 7 (11)).

If we cannont resolve today or tomorrow, then let's pick back up next week.

Rob Pond  
571-272-6760